



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

ZARATHUSHTRA, PHILO, THE ACHAEMENIDS AND ISRAEL. By *Lawrence Heyworth Mills*, Professor of Zend Philology in the University of Oxford. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1906. Pp. xiii, 460.

The problem of the relation of Zoroastrianism, the religion of ancient Persia, to Greek philosophy and the faith of Israel is one of unusual interest, and to its solution more than one scholar has bent his energy. The names of Kohut, Stave, Söderblom, Böklen, Spiegel, Röth, and Gladisch at once recur to mind, especially as regards the supposed association of Zoroastrianism and Judaism. The question of the relation of the Iranian faith with Greek philosophy, on the other hand, received comparatively slight attention until the French scholar James Darmesteter formulated the theory that the Avesta was written during the early centuries after Christ and was profoundly influenced by Alexandrine philosophy. This theory, an unhappy aberration on the part of a great scholar, has found but little favor, and it is not impossible that he might later have modified his views, had he not been called away by death. Realizing this possibility, the majority of scholars have been content to record his hypothesis, and, without directly polemizing against it, to quietly supersede it by the almost obvious facts which render it plainly untenable. In view of the great services of Darmesteter to Iranian scholarship, this attitude seems eminently proper; notwithstanding this, Professor Mills deems the theories formulated by the French scholar not only erroneous but so dangerous as to call for a detailed refutation. To this object the first half of the volume under discussion seems to be devoted, and it must be conceded that the author has ably proved his contention and re-established the older hypothesis that Zoroastrianism was prior to the rise of Neo-Platonic and Alexandrine philosophy, and that it was, consequently, altogether influenced by it. Darmesteter based his theory in part on an alleged "letter of Tansar," supposed to have been written about 226 A. D., although the earliest form in which the document is extant dates from 1210. Around this Tansar a mass of tradition seems to have accumulated, for Mas'udi, a Perso-Arabic historian of the ninth century, terms him a "Platonist." The only fact certainly known concerning Tansar is that he "appeared with an exposition recovered from the Avesta, and was ordered to complete the scripture from that exposition. He did so accordingly, to preserve a similitude of the splendor of the original enlightenment in the treasury of Shapigan, and was ordered to distribute copies of the information provided" (Dinkart, in *SBE*, XXXVII, pp. xxxi, 414). The letter ascribed to this Iranian priest is plainly a literary embellishment of a kernel

which is probably historic. Parallels will readily suggest themselves from speeches recorded by classical writers. That Darmesteter should have given credence to so suspicious a document is indeed strange, and it is in itself significant of the weakness of his theory of the late origin of the Avesta. Taking up the letter in detail, Professor Mills distinguishes accurately between the historic and spurious elements in it. It is safe to say that the "letter of Tansar" will no longer be used as a serious argument in connection with the Avesta.

A far more serious problem is the question of Alexandrine influence on the Avesta, a theory also suggested by Darmesteter. In refutation of this hypothesis, Mills presents an elaborate study of the development of the doctrine of the Logos in Greek philosophy, paying special attention to the Philonian concept. One of the most noteworthy passages of Philo in this connection is his exegesis of Numbers xxxv. 6, where he explains the "six cities for refuge" as "the Divine Logos" (which he terms, however, a "metropolis" rather than a "city"), "Formative Power," "Kingly Power," "Power of Mercy," "the Legislative (city)," and "the Intelligible World." These "cities" Professor Mills compares in detail with the six Avesta Amshaspands, or "Immortal Holy Ones," Vohu Manah ("Good Mind"), Asha Vahishta ("Best Righteousness"), Khshathra Vairya ("Desirable Kingdom"), Spenta Armaiti ("Holy Concord"), Haurvatat ("Saving Health"), and Ameretat ("Immortality"). Admitting certain points of accidental coincidence, as is but natural, he shows conclusively that the divergencies both in detail and in spirit are far too great to admit of any influence of the one system of thought on the other. The Philonian Logos and "Powers" are essentially Greek, and the "Powers" themselves are rather demiurges, standing between God and matter, than the councillors and aids of the Deity, as are the Zoroastrian Amshaspands with regard to Ahura Mazda. The Amshaspands find their analogue, and, perhaps, their origin, in the Adityas and India, and they are ancient concepts, being, it may be suggested, primarily nature-deities. Nor does the Logos of Greek philosophy find any parallel in the Avesta, for the Philonian Logos is again a demiurge, while Vohu Manah or Asha, with whom the Logos presents occasional slight points of resemblance, works directly with Ahura Mazda in the active governance of the world. The concept of the demiurge, saving the Deity from contact with matter, is unknown to the Iranian mind. As Mills happily says (p. 119), "the Greek dualism was one between God and matter, whereas the Zarathushtrian was one between a good God and an evil God, each original and independent, matter not being regarded as in itself evil in any sense."

If the first half of Professor Mills's work is of special interest to philosophers, the second part appeals particularly to theologians. The contact of Persia with Israel was, politically at least, so close, that it has become the fashion, especially since the days of Kohut and Cheyne, to ascribe to Zoroastrianism the origin of the Jewish angelology and demonology. In considering the problem of the relation of the two religions, the author first shows the harmony of the Biblical edicts of Second Chronicles, Ezra, and Isaiah with the Babylonian vase-inscription of Cyrus. This text is well known and, taken in connection with the Old Testament and the Old Persian inscriptions, proves, it must be confessed, that Cyrus was, religiously speaking, little more

than a clever politician. The inscriptions of the Achæmenian kings themselves are subjected to a searching critique by Professor Mills, with the result that they are found to substantiate the statements of the Old Testament. This, however, is only what we should expect to find, especially in view of the author's excellent suggestion that the stereotyped phraseology of the Old Persian texts of Darius "actually cast more light upon the state of feeling at the time of Cyrus than the one extended inscription left to us by Cyrus himself has done" (p. 245). When, on the other hand, he advances the hypothesis that the Biblical phrase "Lord God of heaven" (e. g., Ezra, i. 2) implies that the deity of Cyrus was Deva, "He of the shining sky," it is difficult to follow him, for *daēva* (the Iranian equivalent of the Sanskrit *dēva*, "god") means only "demon." This, fortunately, does not interfere with the course of the argument presented by the author, particularly as Ahura Mazda, the supreme deity of the Iranians, and repeatedly mentioned in the Achæmenian inscriptions, was essentially a sky-god.

That the Iranian dualism was well developed at an early period is clearly shown, as Professor Mills points out, by the implied, though veiled, attack on this doctrine in Isaiah xlv. 6-7: "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things"—an emphatic denial of the dualism which was a cardinal feature of Zoroastrianism, and which may have existed (although we lack specific data to prove the supposition) in Persia in the days of Cyrus and Darius. At a later period, pre-eminently in Gnosticism, dualism was fated to become a religious doctrine of wide acceptance. Yet is dualism in Judaism and Christianity necessarily Persian in origin? Did not the serpent strive against God in the Garden of Eden? If dualism found acceptance among the Jews and Christians, so that Satan is "the prince of this world" (John xiv. 30), it was, it may be suggested, because the germs were already present before the Jews came into contact with the Persians. The same statement holds good, it may be suggested, with regard to Satan as parallel with the Persian Ahriman, and also in respect to the Jewish angelology and demonology which many hold to be borrowed from the Iranians. Professor Mills touches comparatively lightly on these and similar problems, yet it would seem that he somewhat overrates Iranianism in its influence on Judaism. Nevertheless, his work marks a distinct advance. On the other hand, he might have made a more thorough study of the purely Semitic side of the Jewish religion, especially in its relations to Babylonia and Assyria, thus showing, perhaps, that certain elements in Judaism, supposed by many to be Persian in origin, are actually purely Semitic in source.

One of the most admirable sections of this important book deals with the moot question of the relationship of the Old Persian religion, as represented by the inscriptions of the Achæmenians, with the Zoroastrian religion. The majority of scholars incline to the belief that the Achæmenidæ were Zoroastrians, the present reviewer being one of the few who maintain that while these kings were worshipers of Ahura Mazda, there is no evidence to show that they were adherents of the reformed Iranian faith taught by Zoroaster. It is particularly noteworthy, accordingly, to find Professor Mills reaching the conclusion that, although there are many points of contact between the religion described in the Old Persian inscriptions and the Avesta,

"upon absolute identity we must not waste a thought" (p. 291), for the Zoroastrian and Daric creeds were distinct and separate (p. 329). Here, in discussing the parallelism in diction between the Old Persian inscriptions and the Avesta, attention might be called to the still more striking analogies between the phraseology of the Old Persian texts and the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions, the latter exercising a strong influence on the style of the former. That Darius recognized the existence of a demonic opponent of Ormazd, as Professor Mills points out, is a view which cannot well be denied, and the Achæmenian monarch also knew the Amshaspands in all probability, especially if these archangels were originally nature-gods. The author's close analysis of the character of Darius, as revealed by his inscriptions, is likewise of exceptional interest.

The concluding pages of the book under consideration are concerned with an investigation of the date of the Gathas on the basis of internal evidence, a clinching of the argument of the earlier portion of the work. This date he sets between 650 and 900 B. C. According to Iranian tradition, which in this case, at least, seems to be well founded, Zoroaster, the probable author of the Gathas, was born in 660 B. C. and died in 583. While Professor Mills prefers the earlier date, the bulk of evidence seems to favor the latter. He is in accord, however, with the best views on the recrudescence of the popular Iranian faith after the subsidence of the reform inaugurated by Zoroaster. The final pages are, as the author says, an "apocopated report," and treat of the relations of Judaism and Zoroastrianism. This part of the book is not worked out in the detailed and profound manner which characterizes the admirable pages which precede it—it is, indeed, rather a collection of notes. Yet, if it is, as all will hope, a promise of good things to come, and the precursor of a new work from Professor Mills, so preeminently fitted by his mastery of the Old and New Testaments and of the Avesta and Pahlavi writings, there is a wealth of promise in these few pages. Nevertheless, here again the need of the study of Babylonia and Assyria must be emphasized, lest true Semitic elements in Judaism be interpreted as Persian, and some consideration should also be given to Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Again, is it not possible that Semitic (though not necessarily, or even probably, Hebrew) influences have been at work in the Avesta itself, vague and uncertain though these hypothesized factors may be? At all events, a complete study of the problem of the relation between Zoroastrianism and Judaism must take this contingency into account, even though it lead only to negative results.

Throughout the work runs evidence of intense enthusiasm for the subject and deep study of the theme. A worthy successor of the same scholar's editions and translations of the Gathas, it will take its place among the books which are indispensable to the student of Iranian thought; and more than this, *Zarathushtra, Philo, the Achæmenids and Israel* rightly emphasizes, for the first time in English, the importance of the Avesta and of the Old Persian inscriptions for the Christian theologian.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

CHINESE MADE EASY. By *Walter Brooks Brouner, A. B., M. D., and Fung Yuet Mow*. New York and London: Macmillan Co., 1904.

Chinese Made Easy is a book that will be welcome in many quarters, even among those people who never intend to go to China. Some years ago the